



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

(2)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,566	01/28/2004	Masafumi Nishitani	Q79620	8137
23373	7590	06/07/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				HUNTER, ALVIN A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3711		

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/765,566	NISHITANI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 6-9 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/12/2004.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I, claim 2, in the reply filed on May 20, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim 3 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 20, 2005.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda (USPN 6878073).

Regarding claim 4, Takeda discloses a hollow golf club head including at least one of titanium and titanium alloy wherein the club head comprises a front body including a face portion **16**, a back body **17**, a middle body **22** disposed between the front and back body and extending from a toe side of a side portion to a heel side of the side portion through a crown portion bending upwardly wherein Figures 1 and 5 shows the middle portion thinner than the front body and the back body wherein thinner is

being interpreted as the length of from the face to the back of the club head (See Column 3, lines 13 through 21).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komata (JP 10-015118) in view of Nakahara et al. (US 2003/0125127).

Regarding claim 1, Komata et al. discloses a hollow golf club head including at least one of titanium and titanium alloy wherein the club head comprises a front body including a face portion, a back body, a middle body disposed between the front and back body and extending from a toe side of a side portion to a heel side of the side portion through a crown portion bending upwardly (See Figure 6 and Paragraph 0028). Takeda notes that the bodies may be made of various materials, but does not disclose the other materials or the longitudinal elastic modulus of the middle body. Nakahara et al. teaches a club head made of different materials versus a single, same material wherein the crown portion, or middle portion, comprises an aluminum alloy based on the material the club head body is composed of (See Paragraph 0011). Nakahara et al. inherently discloses the crown material having a longitudinal elasticity as that claimed by the applicant because Nakahara et al. discloses the same material disclosed by the

applicant (aluminum). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to having the middle portion made of aluminum alloy having a longitudinal modulus as disclosed by Nakahara et al. in order to increase the repulsion of the club head.

Regarding claim 2, Nakahara et al. disclose the middle portion made of aluminum, which inherently has a melt point lower than 700 °C.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the combination of Komata and Nakahara et al. would result in the middle body including at least a crown portion, sole portion, and side portion..

Regarding claims 8 and 9, From Figure 6, it clear appears that the middle body has a ration to the rest of the club head of less than about 1/3.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Vidovich, can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*AHH*  
Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.

*GV*  
GREGORY VIDOVICH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700